l					
1 2 3 4 5	ALAN R. BRAYTON, ESQ., S.B. #73685 DAVID R. DONADIO, ESQ., S.B. #154436 NANCE F. BECKER, ESQ., S.B. #99292 BRAYTON PURCELL LLP Attorneys at Law 222 Rush Landing Road P.O. Box 6169 Novato, California 94948-6169 (415) 898-1555				
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff				
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	JOHN RUBI,	}	No. C05-3445 MJJ		
12	Plaintiff,	{	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER OF DISMISSAL AND REMAND		
13	vs.	{	TO STATE COURT		
14	ALLIS-CHALMERS CORPORATION PRODUCT LIABILITY TRUST, et al.	{			
15	Defendants.				
16		1			
17					
18	Case 3:95-62-03445-M STIPULATED by and between the parties to this action through their				
19	designated counsel that:				
20	1. This case was originally filed in the Superior Court of California for the County of				
21	San Francisco, action no. CGC 04 436613.				
22	2. Defendant MCDONNELL DOUGLAS CORPORATION ("MDC") filed its Notice				
23	of Removal on August 24, 2002, claiming that this Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under				
24	28 U.S.C. §1442(a)(1), on the ground that defendant MDC was acting under the direction of				
25	agencies and officers of the United States government.				
26	3. Defendant MDC is dismissed from the above entitled action, pursuant to				
27	Fed.R.Civ.Proc. 41 (a)(2). This dismissal is with prejudice, each party to bear its own costs.				
28	///				
	K:\Injured\102536\USDC-stip-dismiss-remand MDC1 wpd	1			
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER OF DI	ISMIS	SAL AND REMAND TO STATE COURT; C05-3445		

28

ı			
1	4. The parties note that plaintiff John	n Rubi is also a plaintiff in the related case, Manuel	
2	Rampola et al. v. Viacom Inc., et al., Northern District California case no. CO5-1461 MJJ,		
3	which has been conditionally transferred to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania Multi District		
4	Litigation Docket No. 875, In re Ashestos Products Liability Litigation. The parties hereto have		
5	also entered into a Stipulation for dismissal of MDC, with prejudice, from that action.		
6	5. Because the sole removing defendant has been dismissed, no basis currently exists		
7	for this Court to exercise jurisdiction over this action, remand to the Superior Court of		
8	California for the County of San Francisco is appropriate.		
9	Accordingly, the parties petition this court for an order dismissing defendant		
10	MCDONNELL DOUGLAS CORPORATION, with prejudice, and remanding the action to the		
11	Superior Court of California for the County of San Francisco.		
12			
13	SO STIPULATED.		
14	Dated: August 26, 2005	BRYAN CAVE LLP	
15		M 1 2 .	
16		By: Paul A Levin	
17	·	Attorneys for Defendant McDONNELL DOUGLAS CORP.	
18	ase 3:05-cv-03445-MJJ Document 5	Filed 08/26/2005 Page 2 of 2	
19	Dated: August 26, 2005	BRAYTON PURCELL LLP	
20	2		
21		By: Wince F Recker	
22		Attorneys for Plaintiff, JOHN RUBI	
23	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
24	A		
25	Dated: 8/30/2005		
26		"/ Jaking	
27		MARTIN J. JENKINS United States District Court Judge	
	4		

2 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER OF DISMISSAL AND REMAND TO STATE COURT; C05-3445 MIJ